

Heat-flow monotonicity related to the Hausdorff-Young inequality

Bennett, Jonathan; Bez, Richard; Carbery, A

DOI:
[10.1112/blms/bdp073](https://doi.org/10.1112/blms/bdp073)

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):
Bennett, J, Bez, R & Carbery, A 2009, 'Heat-flow monotonicity related to the Hausdorff-Young inequality', *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, vol. 41, pp. 971-979. <https://doi.org/10.1112/blms/bdp073>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

HEAT-FLOW MONOTONICITY RELATED TO THE HAUSDORFF–YOUNG INEQUALITY

JONATHAN BENNETT, NEAL BEZ, AND ANTHONY CARBERY

ABSTRACT. It is known that if q is an even integer then the $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ norm of the Fourier transform of a superposition of translates of a fixed gaussian is monotone increasing as their centres “simultaneously slide” to the origin. We provide explicit examples to show that this monotonicity property fails dramatically if $q > 2$ is not an even integer. These results are equivalent, upon rescaling, to similar statements involving solutions to heat equations. Such considerations are natural given the celebrated theorem of Beckner concerning the gaussian extremisability of the Hausdorff–Young inequality.

For $d \in \mathbb{N}$ we let H_t denote the heat kernel on \mathbb{R}^d given by

$$H_t(x) = t^{-d/2} e^{-\pi|x|^2/t},$$

and we define the Fourier transform $\widehat{\mu}$ of a finite Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d by

$$\widehat{\mu}(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-2\pi i x \cdot \xi} d\mu(x).$$

In what follows, for $p \in [1, \infty]$, p' will denote the dual exponent satisfying $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$. For μ a positive finite Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^d and $2 \leq q \leq p' \leq \infty$, let $Q_{p,q} : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$Q_{p,q}(t) = t^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p'})} \left\| \widehat{u(t, \cdot)^{1/p}} \right\|_q,$$

where $u(t, \cdot) = H_t * \mu$. If $q = 2k$ is an even integer then by Plancherel’s theorem one may write $Q_{p,q}$ in terms of a k -fold convolution

$$(1) \quad Q_{p,q}(t) = t^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p'})} \|u(t, \cdot)^{1/p} * \dots * u(t, \cdot)^{1/p}\|_2^{2/q}.$$

Expressions of this type are by now well-known to be nondecreasing for $t > 0$ and this follows from the heat-flow approach to generalised Young’s inequalities developed in [4] (see also [8]). For the convenience of the reader, in the Appendix we have included a sketch of how this monotonicity follows from [4]. We note that for $p = 1$ this is a particularly straightforward exercise using the fact that $\widehat{H_t}(\xi) = e^{-\pi t|\xi|^2}$. The purpose of this article is to show that this heat-flow monotonicity fails dramatically if q is not an even integer.

The first and second authors were supported by EPSRC grant EP/E022340/1. The third author would like to thank William Beckner for many useful and interesting conversations on the sharp Hausdorff–Young inequality.

Theorem 1. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $2 \leq q \leq p' \leq \infty$ and suppose q is not an even integer. Then there exists a positive finite Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d such that if $u(t, \cdot) = H_t * \mu$ then*

$$Q_{p,q}(t) := t^{\frac{d}{2}(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p'})} \left\| \widehat{u(t, \cdot)^{1/p}} \right\|_q$$

is strictly decreasing for sufficiently small $t > 0$.

By making an appropriate rescaling one may rephrase the above results in terms of “sliding gaussians” in the following way. Let μ be a positive finite Borel measure on \mathbb{R}^d , and define $f : (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f(t, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-\pi|x-tv|^2} d\mu(v).$$

We interpret f as a superposition of translates of a fixed gaussian, which simultaneously slide to the origin as t tends to zero. For $2 \leq q \leq p' \leq \infty$ define the quantity $\tilde{Q}_{p,q}(t)$ by

$$\tilde{Q}_{p,q}(t) = \| \widehat{f(t, \cdot)^{1/p}} \|_q.$$

The nondecreasingness of $Q_{p,q}$ for q an even integer tells us that $\tilde{Q}_{p,q}(t)$ is non-increasing, and Theorem 1 tells us that whenever q is not an even integer, there exist such measures μ for which $\tilde{Q}_{p,q}(t)$ is *strictly increasing* for sufficiently large t . It is interesting to note that the quantity $\|f(t, \cdot)\|_{q'/p}^{1/p}$, related to $\tilde{Q}_{p,q}(t)$ via the Hausdorff–Young inequality

$$\tilde{Q}_{p,q}(t) \leq \|f(t, \cdot)^{1/p}\|_{q'} = \|f(t, \cdot)\|_{q'/p}^{1/p},$$

is nonincreasing for all $2 \leq q \leq p' \leq \infty$, whether q is an even integer or not. See [4].

The quantities $Q_{p,q}$ have a more direct relation with the Hausdorff–Young inequality when $q = p'$. In particular, if $q = p'$ is an even integer, then since $Q_{p,q}$ is nondecreasing in this case,

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} Q_{p,q}(t) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} Q_{p,q}(t).$$

Now, if for $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we set $d\mu(x) = |f(x)|^p dx$, then clearly $\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} Q_{p,q}(t)$ coincides with $\|\widehat{f}\|_{p'}$ which, by virtue of the fact that p' is even, is greater than or equal to $\|\widehat{f}\|_{p'}$. Furthermore, by a simple change of variables, one can easily show that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} Q_{p,q}(t) = \left\| \widehat{H_1^{1/p}} \right\|_{p'} \|f\|_p$$

where H_1 is the heat kernel at time $t = 1$. One therefore recovers the sharp form of the Hausdorff–Young inequality on \mathbb{R}^d

$$(2) \quad \|\widehat{f}\|_{p'} \leq \left(\frac{p^{1/p}}{p'^{1/p'}} \right)^{d/2} \|f\|_p$$

for p' an even integer, due to Babenko [1], [2]. We note that since (2) is not valid in general for $p' < 2$ it follows that $Q_{p,q}(t)$ cannot possibly be nondecreasing for $t > 0$ when $q = p'$ is strictly less than 2.

Theorem 1 is of course a significant obstacle to finding a proof based on heat-flow of the sharp Hausdorff–Young inequality due to Beckner [6], [7]; i.e. for *all* $p' \in [2, \infty)$. It should also be remarked that whenever $p' \in [2, \infty)$ is not an even integer there exists $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$(3) \quad \|\widehat{f}\|_{p'} > \|\widehat{|f|}\|_{p'}.$$

Thus, in general, it is not without loss of generality that one considers nonnegative initial data for the heat-flow. Inequality (3) may be seen as a consequence of an observation due to Hardy and Littlewood [9] concerning a majorant problem in the context of classical Fourier series. In fact, the counterexamples in our proof of Theorem 1 are somewhat in the spirit of the Hardy–Littlewood majorant counterexample in [9].

The idea of looking for monotone quantities underlying inequalities in analysis is of course not new. One way of constructing such quantities which has been successful in recent years is via heat-flow methods of the type we consider here. As we have already mentioned, this heat-flow perspective applies to a wide variety of so-called generalised Young’s inequalities (or Brascamp–Lieb inequalities), which include the classical Young’s convolution, multilinear Hölder, and Loomis–Whitney inequalities – see [8] and [4]. Among other notable (and closely related) examples from harmonic analysis are certain multilinear analogues of Kakeya maximal inequalities [5] and adjoint restriction inequalities for the Fourier transform – see the forthcoming [3].

PROOF OF THEOREM 1

It suffices to handle $d = 1$, since if μ is a one-dimensional counterexample, then its d -fold tensor product is a d -dimensional counterexample. The case $p = 1$ will turn out to be pivotal and so we deal with that first of all.

Observe that if μ is a finite sum of Dirac delta measures each supported at an integer, then $\widehat{\mu}$ is a trigonometric polynomial, and thus a bounded periodic function on \mathbb{R} with period 1. If c_n denotes the n th Fourier coefficient of $|\widehat{\mu}|^q$, then

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{1,q}(t)^q &= t^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{H}_t(\xi)^q |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^q d\xi \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} c_n t^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{H}_t(\xi)^q e^{2\pi i n \xi} d\xi \\ &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} c_n t^{1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-q\pi t \xi^2} e^{2\pi i n \xi} d\xi \\ &= q^{-1/2} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} c_n e^{-\pi n^2 / qt}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $q > 2$ it follows that $|\widehat{\mu}|^q$ is continuously differentiable everywhere and thus the Fourier coefficients of $|\widehat{\mu}|^q$ are absolutely summable. This is sufficient to justify

the above interchange of summation and integration. Furthermore, note that

$$\sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z} \\ n \neq 0}} n^2 c_n t^{-2} e^{-\pi n^2 / qt}$$

is uniformly convergent because, trivially, each summand is bounded in modulus by an absolute constant (i.e. independent of $t > 0$ and $n \neq 0$) multiple of $1/n^2$. Again, by standard results, it follows that we may differentiate the above expression for $Q_{1,q}(t)^q$ term by term to get,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}[Q_{1,q}(t)^q] &= \frac{\pi}{q^{3/2}} t^{-2} \sum_{\substack{n \in \mathbb{Z} \\ n \neq 0}} n^2 c_n e^{-\pi n^2 / qt} \\ &= \frac{\pi}{q^{3/2}} t^{-2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2 (c_n + c_{-n}) e^{-\pi n^2 / qt} \\ &= \frac{\pi}{q^{3/2}} t^{-2} e^{-\pi / qt} \left(c_1 + c_{-1} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n^2 (c_n + c_{-n}) e^{-\pi(n^2-1)/qt} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is, in particular, a bounded sequence it follows that

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n^2 (c_n + c_{-n}) e^{-\pi(n^2-1)/qt} \longrightarrow 0$$

as t tends to zero. Thus, to prove Theorem 1 when $p = 1$ it suffices to find a μ formed out of a finite sum of Dirac delta measures each supported at an integer and such that

$$(4) \quad c_1 + c_{-1} < 0.$$

To this end, we let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be coprime, $r \in (0, 1/2)$ and

$$(5) \quad \mu := \delta_0 + r\delta_m + r\delta_n,$$

so that

$$\widehat{\mu}(\xi) = 1 + re^{-2\pi i m \xi} + re^{-2\pi i n \xi}.$$

Since $|\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^2 = \widehat{\mu}(\xi) \overline{\widehat{\mu}(\xi)}$ we have that

$$|\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^q = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k r^k (e^{-2\pi i m \xi} + e^{-2\pi i n \xi})^k \sum_{k'=0}^{\infty} a_{k'} r^{k'} (e^{2\pi i m \xi} + e^{2\pi i n \xi})^{k'}$$

where a_k is the k th binomial coefficient in the expansion of $(1+x)^{q/2}$; i.e.

$$a_k = \frac{\frac{q}{2}(\frac{q}{2}-1) \dots (\frac{q}{2}-k+1)}{k!}.$$

Observe that if $k < q/2 + 1$ then $a_k > 0$, and thereafter a_k is strictly alternating in sign. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 + c_{-1} &= \int_0^1 |\widehat{\mu}(\xi)|^q (e^{-2\pi i \xi} + e^{2\pi i \xi}) d\xi \\ &= \sum_{k,k'=0}^{\infty} a_k a_{k'} r^{k+k'} \\ &\quad \times \int_0^1 (e^{-2\pi i m \xi} + e^{-2\pi i n \xi})^k (e^{2\pi i m \xi} + e^{2\pi i n \xi})^{k'} (e^{-2\pi i \xi} + e^{2\pi i \xi}) d\xi \end{aligned}$$

(of course, since μ is a real measure it follows that $|\widehat{\mu}|$ is even and therefore $c_1 = c_{-1}$; nevertheless it is slightly more convenient to consider $c_1 + c_{-1}$ in order to preserve a certain symmetry later in the proof). To justify the above interchange of summation and integration, it suffices to show that $\sum_{k \geq 0} |a_k| (2r)^k$ is finite. Since $(a_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is a bounded sequence and $r \in (0, 1/2)$ this is immediate. Therefore,

$$c_1 + c_{-1} = \sum_{k, k'=0}^{\infty} a_k a_{k'} r^{k+k'} \sum_{(\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}') \in \Lambda_{k, k'}} \binom{k}{j_1} \binom{k'}{j'_1}$$

where

$$\Lambda_{k, k'} := \{(\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}') = ((j_1, j_2), (j'_1, j'_2)) \in (\mathbb{N}_0^2)^2 : j_1 + j_2 = k, j'_1 + j'_2 = k' \text{ and } m(j_1 - j'_1) + n(j_2 - j'_2) = \pm 1\}$$

and $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

We claim that by choosing m and n appropriately (depending on q) we can ensure that $\Lambda_{k, k'}$ is empty *whenever* $a_k a_{k'} > 0$. It will only remain to check that $\Lambda_{k, k'}$ is nonempty for some k and k' for which $a_k a_{k'} < 0$. The proof of the claim proceeds as follows. Firstly, a simple argument will show that if $n - m$ is even the sets $\Lambda_{k, k'}$ are empty whenever k and k' have the same parity. A second argument will show that $\Lambda_{k, k'}$ is empty whenever one of k and k' is less than $q/2 + 1$ upon an appropriate choice of m and n . This leaves a contribution from summands with k and k' greater than $q/2 + 1$ and, as long as one summand is nonzero, it is clear that $c_1 + c_{-1} < 0$ as required.

We now turn to the details. Since m and n are coprime there exist integers α_0 and β_0 such that

$$(6) \quad \alpha_0 m + \beta_0 n = 1;$$

moreover if $\alpha m + \beta n = \pm 1$ for integers α and β then

$$(\alpha, \beta) = \pm(\alpha_0, \beta_0) + N(n, -m) \quad \text{for some } N \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Therefore, if $(\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}') \in \Lambda_{k, k'}$ then

$$(7) \quad j_1 - j'_1 = \pm \alpha_0 + Nn$$

and

$$(8) \quad j_2 - j'_2 = \pm \beta_0 - Nm$$

for some $N \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$(9) \quad j_1 + j_2 = k,$$

and

$$(10) \quad j'_1 + j'_2 = k'.$$

Lemma 2. *Suppose $n - m$ is even, and that k and k' have the same parity. Then $\Lambda_{k, k'}$ is empty.*

Proof. Let $(\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}') \in \Lambda_{k, k'}$. By summing equations (7), (8), (9), and (10) it follows that

$$(11) \quad 2(j_1 + j_2) = \pm(\alpha_0 + \beta_0) + (n - m)N + k + k'.$$

So $n - m$ even implies $\alpha_0 + \beta_0$ is even. On the other hand, $n - m$ even and

$$(\alpha_0 + \beta_0)m + (n - m)\beta_0 = 1$$

imply that $\alpha_0 + \beta_0$ is odd. Hence $\Lambda_{k,k'} = \emptyset$. \square

For fixed integers α_0 and β_0 satisfying (6), define

$$\alpha_* := \min\{|\alpha_0 + Nn| : N \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

and

$$\beta_* := \min\{|\beta_0 - Nm| : N \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Lemma 3. *Suppose m and n are positive integers. Then the set $\Lambda_{k,k'}$ is empty whenever*

$$(12) \quad k' \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq k \leq \min\{\alpha_*, \beta_*\} - 1$$

or

$$k \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq k' \leq \min\{\alpha_*, \beta_*\} - 1.$$

Proof. By symmetry, it suffices to check that $\Lambda_{k,k'}$ is empty when (12) holds. Suppose $(\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}') \in \Lambda_{k,k'}$ and set $(\alpha, \beta) := (j_1 - j'_1, j_2 - j'_2)$ so that $\alpha m + \beta n = \pm 1$. By (7), (8), (9) and (10) it follows that

$$k \geq j_1 \geq j_1 - j'_1 = \pm \alpha_0 + Nn$$

and

$$k \geq j_2 \geq j_2 - j'_2 = \pm \beta_0 - Nm$$

for some $N \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $m(j_1 - j'_1) + n(j_2 - j'_2) = \pm 1$, we have that $\pm \alpha_0 + Nn$ and $\pm \beta_0 - Nm$ must have opposing signs. Therefore,

$$k \geq \min_{N \in \mathbb{Z}} \min\{|\alpha_0 + Nn|, |\beta_0 - Nm|\} = \min\{\alpha_*, \beta_*\}.$$

Hence $\Lambda_{k,k'}$ is empty when (12) holds. \square

To complete the proof of Theorem 1 when $p = 1$, let $k(q)$ denote the smallest integer greater than $q/2 + 1$ and consider the following particularly simple choice of m and n :

$$m = 2k(q) + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad n = m + 2.$$

Now

$$(13) \quad \left(\frac{m+1}{2}\right)m + \left(-\frac{m-1}{2}\right)n = 1$$

and an easy calculation shows that

$$\alpha_* = k(q) + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_* = k(q).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2 and Lemma 3,

$$c_1 + c_{-1} = \sum_{\substack{k, k' \geq k(q) \\ k, k' \text{ opposing parity}}} a_k a_{k'} r^{k+k'} \sum_{(\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}') \in \Lambda_{k,k'}} \binom{k}{j_1} \binom{k'}{j'_1}.$$

Moreover, (13) trivially implies that $\Lambda_{k(q)+1, k(q)}$ is nonempty and hence $c_1 + c_{-1} < 0$, as required.

We remark that there are many choices of the integers m and n which would have worked when $p = 1$. Our argument for $p > 1$ below capitalises on the fact that there exist m and n separated by a distance $O(m)$ and such that $\Lambda_{k,k'}$ continues to be empty whenever $a_k a_{k'} > 0$. Moreover, we shall require that m can be chosen as large as we please. To see that such a choice of m and n is possible, suppose

$$(14) \quad m = 3k_0 + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad n = 2m + 3$$

where k_0 is an even integer greater than $q/2 + 1$. A straightforward computation shows that

$$(15) \quad \left(\frac{2m+1}{3}\right)m + \left(-\frac{m-1}{3}\right)n = 1$$

and consequently

$$\alpha_* = 2k_0 + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_* = k_0.$$

Furthermore, Λ_{2k_0+1,k_0} is nonempty by (15). Since k_0 is even it again follows from Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 that $c_1 + c_{-1} < 0$. We emphasise that k_0 can be as large as we please in this argument.

Now suppose $p > 1$ and let m and n be given by (14). The idea behind the remainder of the proof is the following. It is clear that for sufficiently large m and small $t > 0$, $H_t * \mu$ is a finite sum of “well-separated” gaussians causing $(H_t * \mu)^{1/p}$ to be “very close” to $H_t^{1/p} * \tilde{\mu}$, where

$$\tilde{\mu} := \delta_0 + r^{1/p} \delta_m + r^{1/p} \delta_n.$$

Given this, $Q_{p,q}(t)^q$ should be “very close” to

$$p^{dq/2} t^{d/2} \|\widehat{H_{pt} * \tilde{\mu}}\|_q^q.$$

Furthermore, if $r \in (0, 1/2^p)$, this last quantity, as we have seen, is strictly decreasing for sufficiently small t with derivative bounded above in modulus by a constant multiple of $t^{-2} e^{-\pi/pqt}$. Thus, to conclude our proof of Theorem 1 when $p > 1$, it suffices to check that the error

$$\begin{aligned} E_{p,q}(t) &:= Q_{p,q}(t)^q - p^{dq/2} t^{d/2} \|\widehat{H_{pt} * \tilde{\mu}}\|_q^q \\ &= t^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{q}{p'})} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(|(H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}}| - |(H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu})| \right)^q \end{aligned}$$

has a derivative bound of the form

$$(16) \quad |E'_{p,q}(t)| \leq C t^{-\gamma} e^{-cm^2/t},$$

for sufficiently large m and small t . Here $C = C_{p,q,m}$ denotes a constant that may depend on p , q and m , and $\gamma = \gamma_{p,q}$ and $c = c_{p,q}$ constants that may depend on p and q .

Differentiating and grouping terms we obtain

$$E'_{p,q}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{q}{p'}\right) t^{-\frac{1}{2}(1+\frac{q}{p'})} (I + II) + t^{\frac{1}{2}(1-\frac{q}{p'})} (III + IV),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I &:= \int |((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge}|^{q-2} ((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge} \left(((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge} - (H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu})^{\wedge} \right), \\
II &:= \int (H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu})^{\wedge} \left(|((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge}|^{q-2} ((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge} - |(H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu})^{\wedge}|^{q-2} (H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu})^{\wedge} \right), \\
III &:= \int |((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge}|^{q-2} ((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge} \left((\partial_t (H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge} - (\partial_t H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu})^{\wedge} \right), \\
IV &:= \int (\partial_t H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu})^{\wedge} \left(|((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge}|^{q-2} ((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge} - |(H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu})^{\wedge}|^{q-2} (H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu})^{\wedge} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Bounds of the form (16) are easily obtained for I , II , III and IV by elementary estimates, such as the Cauchy–Schwarz and Hausdorff–Young inequalities, along with pointwise estimates on the heat kernel H_t . We illustrate this for the term I , leaving the remaining terms to the reader. Applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, the Hausdorff–Young inequality and Plancherel’s theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I &\lesssim \left(\int |((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge}|^{2(q-1)} \right)^{1/2} \left(\int |((H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}})^{\wedge} - (H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu})^{\wedge}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\int (H_t * \mu)^{\frac{2(q-1)}{(2q-3)p}} \right)^{\frac{2q-3}{2}} \left(\int |(H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}} - H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu}|^2 \right)^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that $q \geq 2$. Now, the first integral factor above is bounded by a power of t (which is permissible). For the second integral factor we split the integration over \mathbb{R} into $\bigcup_0^6 I_j$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_0 &= (-\infty, -\epsilon m], \quad I_1 = [-\epsilon m, \epsilon m], \quad I_2 = [\epsilon m, (1-\epsilon)m], \quad I_3 = [(1-\epsilon)m, (1+\epsilon)m], \\
I_4 &= [(1+\epsilon)m, (1-\epsilon)n], \quad I_5 = [(1-\epsilon)n, (1+\epsilon)n] \quad \text{and} \quad I_6 = [(1+\epsilon)n, \infty),
\end{aligned}$$

for some sufficiently small positive absolute constant ϵ . We claim that a bound of the form (16) holds for each term

$$\int_{I_j} \left| (H_t * \mu)^{\frac{1}{p}} - H_t^{\frac{1}{p}} * \tilde{\mu} \right|^2.$$

For $j = 0, 2, 4, 6$ this is a simple consequence of the triangle inequality combined with elementary estimates on the heat kernel H_t . For $j = 1$ this follows from the facts that for $x \in I_1$,

$$H_t * \mu(x) = H_t(x) + O(t^{-1/2} e^{-cm^2/t})$$

and

$$H_t^{1/p} * \tilde{\mu}(x) = H_t(x)^{1/p} + O(t^{-1/2p} e^{-cm^2/t}),$$

and the mean value theorem applied to the function $x \mapsto x^{1/p}$. The cases $j = 3$ and $j = 5$ are similar.

APPENDIX: THE EVEN INTEGER CASE

We will appeal to the following general theorem from [4] (see Proposition 8.9).

Theorem 4. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n_1, \dots, n_m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p_1, \dots, p_m > 0$. Suppose that for each $1 \leq j \leq m$ there are linear surjections $B_j : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ and $A_j : \mathbb{R}^{n_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$ such that the mapping $M = \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{p_j} B_j^* A_j B_j$ is invertible and

$$B_j M^{-1} B_j^* \leq A_j^{-1}$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq m$. Also, for each $1 \leq j \leq m$ let u_j be a solution to the heat equation

$$(17) \quad \partial_t u_j = \frac{1}{4\pi} \operatorname{div}(A_j^{-1} \nabla u_j).$$

Then the quantity

$$t^{\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{n_j}{p_j} - n)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \prod_{j=1}^m u_j(t, B_j x)^{1/p_j} dx$$

is non-decreasing for $t > 0$.

Multiplying out the L^2 norm in (1), we see that

$$Q_{p,2k}(t)^{2k} = t^{\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{n_j}{p_j} - n)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \prod_{j=1}^m u_j(t, B_j x)^{1/p_j} dx,$$

where $n = (2k-1)d$, $m = 2k$, $n_j = d$, $p_j = p$ and

$$B_j : \quad \mathbb{R}^{(2k-1)d} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \mathbb{R}^d$$

$$(x_1, \dots, x_{2k-1}) \quad \longmapsto \quad \begin{cases} x_j & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, 2k-1 \\ \sum_{j=1}^k x_j - \sum_{j'=k+1}^{2k-1} x_{j'} & \text{for } j = 2k \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, for each $j = 1, \dots, 2k$, $u_j = u$ satisfies the heat equation (17) where A_j is the identity mapping. Since $p_j = p$ for all j , by homogeneity it suffices to verify the remaining hypotheses of Theorem 4 when $p = (2k)'$.

It is straightforward to verify that the matrix $M = \frac{1}{(2k)'} \sum_{j=1}^{2k} B_j^* B_j$ has the following block form representation with respect to the canonical bases.

$$M = \frac{1}{(2k)'} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}(k, k) + I_{kd} & -\mathbf{1}(k, k-1) \\ -\mathbf{1}(k-1, k) & \mathbf{1}(k-1, k-1) + I_{(k-1)d} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\mathbf{1}(r, s)$ denotes the rd by sd matrix given by

$$\mathbf{1}(r, s) = \begin{pmatrix} I_d & I_d & \cdots & I_d \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ I_d & I_d & \cdots & I_d \end{pmatrix}$$

and I_l is the l by l identity matrix. A direct computation shows that M is invertible with

$$M^{-1} = \frac{1}{2k-1} \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{1}(k, k) + 2kI_{kd} & \mathbf{1}(k, k-1) \\ \mathbf{1}(k-1, k) & -\mathbf{1}(k-1, k-1) + 2kI_{(k-1)d} \end{pmatrix}$$

and $B_j M^{-1} B_j^* = I_d$ for each $j = 1, \dots, k$. It now follows from Theorem 4 that $Q_{p,2k}(t)$ is nondecreasing for each $t > 0$.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. I. Babenko, *An inequality in the theory of Fourier integrals*, Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR Ser. Mat. **25** (1961), 531-542.
- [2] K. I. Babenko, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. **44** (1965), 115-128.
- [3] J. M. Bennett, N. Bez, A. Carbery, D. Hundertmark, *Heat-flow monotonicity of Strichartz norms*, in preparation.
- [4] J. M. Bennett, A. Carbery, M. Christ, T. Tao *The Brascamp–Lieb inequalities: finiteness, structure and extremals*. Geom. Funct. Anal. **17** (2007), 1343–1415.
- [5] J. M. Bennett, A. Carbery, T. Tao *On the multilinear restriction and Kakeya conjectures*, Acta Math. **196** (2006), 261–302.
- [6] W. Beckner, *Inequalities in Fourier analysis on \mathbb{R}^n* , Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **72** (1975), 638–641.
- [7] W. Beckner, *Inequalities in Fourier analysis*, Ann. of Math. **102** (1975), 159-182.
- [8] E. A. Carlen, E. H. Lieb, M. Loss, *A sharp analog of Young’s inequality on S^N and related entropy inequalities*, Jour. Geom. Anal. **14** (2004), 487–520.
- [9] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, *Notes on the theory of series (XIX): A problem concerning majorants of Fourier series*, Quart. J. Math. **6** (1935), 304–315.

JONATHAN BENNETT AND NEAL BEZ, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM,
THE WATSON BUILDING, EDGBASTON, BIRMINGHAM, B15 2TT, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: J.Bennett@bham.ac.uk, N.Bez@bham.ac.uk

ANTHONY CARBERY, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, JAMES CLERK
MAXWELL BUILDING, KING’S BUILDINGS, EDINBURGH, EH3 9JZ, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: A.Carbery@ed.ac.uk